Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected.

Claims 1-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083 and Cavill, U.S. Patent No. 6,003,069 (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶1). The Examiner states that Savitzky discloses the invention as claimed except that Savitzky neither discloses communicating a document to an output device nor means for communicating a document to an output device. The Examiner further states that Cavill discloses communicating a document to an output device and means for communicating a document to an output device and that it would have been obvious to adapt the system of Savitzky to communicate a document to an output device and to include means for communicating a document to an output device.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Savitzky discloses an apparatus and method for document processing. A document request is received from client A by HTTP interface 28 of agency 32 (col. 10, lines 33-36). The Examiner suggests that client A responds to the print job agent of Applicants' claims and agency 32 responds to the server of Applicants' claims.

HTTP interface 28 of agency 32 pushes a transaction with the document request onto transaction queue 23 of agency 32 (col. 10, lines 33-36). The Examiner suggests that the transaction pushed onto transaction queue 23 by HTTP interface 28 responds to the original receipt of Applicants' claims.

Proxy agent 36 of agency 32 handles the document request either by requesting the document or generating a transaction, which causes the document to be retrieved (col. 10, lines 36-39). It is noteworthy that any transaction generated by proxy agent 36 is not the same transaction as was

pushed onto transaction queue 23 by HTTP interface 28, since generating a transaction requires the transaction be newly created.

The retrieved document is pushed onto the queue as a transaction when the document is received (col. 10, lines 39-41). It is also noteworthy that this transaction is neither the same transaction as was pushed onto transaction queue 23 by HTTP interface 28 nor the same transaction that was generated by proxy agent 36 which caused the document to be retrieved.

The transaction is matched with a hotlist agent 42 and a follower agent 44 and sent to the client by proxy agent 36 (col. 10, lines 41-46). Hotlist agent 42 examines the document passing to client A and stores a reference to the document in a hotlist database (col. 10, lines 51-53).

Savitzky does not disclose any of the transactions being updated. Each transaction is generated and then handled. Savitzky does not disclose what is done with the transactions after they are handled. However, it is well known in the art that transactions of the kind described in Savitzky are discarded once they are handled.

If, as the Examiner suggests, the transaction pushed onto transaction queue 23 by HTTP interface 28 responds to the original receipt of Applicants' claims, then Savitzky does not disclose updating the original receipt.

In contrast, Applicants' claims 1, 9, and 17 recite, "updating the original receipt" and "means for updating the original receipt."

Furthermore, Savitzky does not disclose any construct that is updated to indicate the document was provided to client A. As discussed above, none of the transactions are updated and thus are not updated to indicate the document was provided to client A.

Hotlist agent 42 merely examines the document as it passes to client A and stores a reference to the document in the hotlist database. Savitzky does not disclose that the reference to the document in the hotlist database includes any indication that the document was provided to client A. Additionally, the function of hotlist agent 42 and the hotlist database as disclosed in Savitzky

suggests that no indication is included in the hotlist database that the document was provided to client A.

In particular, Savitzky suggests that hotlist agent 42 and the hotlist database serve to keep a record of documents so that future document requests may be handled by the hotlist agent 42 if a reference to the future requested document is within the hotlist database. Keeping an indication that the document was provided to client A would not assist in this purpose of hotlist agent 42 and the hotlist database since the destination of the document would not help hotlist agent 42 handle the future document request. Only the origin of the document would help hotlist agent 42 handle the future document request. Therefore, Savitzky does not even suggest anything being updated to indicate the document was provided to client A.

If client A responds to the print job agent of Applicants' claims, Savitzky does not disclose anything that is updated to indicate at least a portion of a document was provided to a print job agent.

In contrast, Applicants' claims 1, 9, and 17 recite, "updating the original receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was provided to the print job agent" and "means for updating the original receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was provided to the print job agent."

The Examiner further states that Savitzky discloses copying the original receipt to the print job agent and updating the copy of the print job agent to indicate the at least one portion of the document was printed. The Examiner now suggests that the document itself responds to the original receipt of Applicants' claims.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Although Savitzky discloses copying the document to client A, Savitzky does not disclose the document being updated to indicate that at least a portion of it was printed, or even that a portion of it was passed on to some other

device or client. Savitzky does not disclose the document being updated to indicate any transfer or movement of the document.

Additionally, the document is the only construct that Savitzky discloses being passed to client A. Therefore, nothing else disclosed by Savitzky responds to being copied to the print job agent of Applicants' claims and updated to indicate a portion of the document was printed, or even passed on to anther device or client. In particular, Savitzky does not disclose the transaction, previously indicated by the Examiner to respond to the original receipt of Applicants' claims, being copied to client A or updated to indicate at least a portion of the document was printed.

In contrast, Applicants' claims 2, 10, and 18 recite, "copying the original receipt to the print job agent; and, updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was printed" and "means for copying the original receipt to the print job agent; and, means for updating the a copy of the receipt to indicate each portion of the document printed."

The Examiner further states that Savitzky discloses conveying a serial number of the output device to the server.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Savitzky does not disclose a serial number of any device being conveyed to any other device.

In contrast, Applicants' claims 5 and 13 recite, "conveying a serial number of the output device to the server" and "means for conveying a serial number of the output device to the server."

The Examiner further states that Savitzky discloses the server obtaining a device specific public key for the output device and encrypting the document using the public key. The Examiner suggests that HTTP GET, PUT, and POST commands are keys for encrypting the document.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is well known in the art that HTTP GET, PUT, and POST commands are not keys for encrypting documents, but rather commands for transferring documents. Furthermore, Applicants have defined a "public key" in the specification. As defined in Applicants' specification a public key is a key for encrypting documents that may only be decrypted using a private key. A private key has a corresponding public key that is accessible by print job server. The private key is unique to the output device.

The definition of public key provided in Applicants' specification does not encompass HTTP GET, PUT, and POST commands. Therefore, Savitzky does not at all disclose a public key.

In contrast, Applicants' claims 7 and 15 recite, "the server obtaining a device specific public key for the output device; and, wherein the server encrypting the at least one portion of the document includes the server using the public key to encrypt the at least one portion of the document" and "means for means for providing to the server a device specific public key for the output device; and, wherein the means for encrypting the at least one portion of the document includes means for using the public key to encrypt the at least one portion of the document."

The Examiner further states that Savitzky discloses communicating a symmetric key to the output device and the server encrypting the document with the symmetric key. The Examiner suggests that HTTP GET, PUT, and POST commands are keys for encrypting the document.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, HTTP GET, PUT, and POST commands are not keys for encrypting documents, but rather commands for transferring documents. Therefore, Savitzky does not at all disclose a symmetric key.

In contrast, Applicants' claims 8 and 16 recite, "the server communicating a symmetric key to the output device and wherein the server encrypting the at least one portion of the document includes the server using

the symmetric key to encrypt the at least one portion of the document" and "means for communicating a symmetric key from the server to the output device and wherein the means for encrypting the at least one portion of the document includes means for using the symmetric key to encrypt the at least one portion of the document."

In view of Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 17 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing arguments are believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson and
James Clough

By Mark G. Pannell
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 09/18/02
(719) 260-7900